Neglected Text: The First Western Statesman to Call for Co-Existence and Negotiation, See Page 4.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 43 NOVEMBER 11, 1957 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Too Late to Catch Up?

The extent of the Russian break-through in space-science and the dimensions of the American defeat are only beginning to be visible. When Lyndon Johnson told a press conference here, "The Russians are ahead of us period," he was making a statement whose full import will slowly unfold itself in the months to come. In the lower echelons of the Capitol, where the real study is done, a suspicion is growing that we may never really "catch up" and will only make ourselves ludicrous when we finally send aloft that first 5-pound satellite alongside not only half-ton Sputnik II but probably more sensational Russian achievements in the skies.

Needed: A Revolution in Education

What the Russians are doing today was begun ten years ago, and we must begin now to plan for 10 and 20 years hence, not just our own satellites, but new technological break-throughs as yet undreamed of, if our national pride is to be saved. But an achievement on a comparable scale will require us to revolutionize our educational system, to raise the general level of everyone's scientific knowledge, to give teaching a lucrative and honored place in our society, and to provide the funds to guarantee that no talented youngster will fall by the way side because he cannot afford a higher education. Some of the billions now spent on arms will have to be shifted to the schools; the choice is between obsolete bombers and obsolete minds. Unfortunately, as Lyndon Johnson also said, "a conservative approach" will not do the job. The Eisenhower Administration still clings to the premise that education is primarily a local matter, though a bold speech by Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Marion Folsom (see page two) shows one fresh mind at work in the Cabinet.

The blunt truth is that the United States cannot afford at this moment in its history to be led by a figurehead retired General, who has neither the knowledge nor the drive for the Presidency, buttressed by a Secretary of State whose slippery utterance, reckless spirit and unctuous claims to partnership with God have earned him universal distrust and distaste. Mr. Dulles at press conference admitted that we were unlikely again to have "during the foreseeable future" the kind of preponderance of military power we had in 1948 or 1949; he spoke of the impossibility of "maintaining the great gap that did exist a decade ago." But what the Pentagon fears is that the balance has already shifted; its nightmare is a space platform from which the Soviets could police the earth. But our diplomacy (if it can be called that) is still based on a situation of strength and an ability to dictate terms which no longer exist if they ever did. When the first news of Krushchev's renewed call for a summit conference and co-existence began coming over the State Department ticker, the official spokesman evaded comment by saying that we hadn't seen the complete text—as if that could make a difference. Yet the new Democratic victories hold out hope of no alternative; the latest pronouncements of Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson show they fundamentally share the Dulles outlook, and are still wedded to the delusion that an intensified arms race may again give us something like that vanished atomic monopoly. Only Gen. Omar Bradley, in a speech at press time on the fatal idiocy of an electronic arms race, struck a rational note in this capital.

Where We're Still Ahead

Q. Mr. Secretary . . . you said that one of the reasons or the reason for the recent Soviet technological achievements is that they have been concentrating for 40 years on this military aspect of technology. But on Friday the President's Committee of Scientists and Engineers briefed the press on this issue and said, 'We must puncture this myth that the Russians succeeded by concentrating all energies on military things. They have concentrated on so broad a variety of fields that it reads like a list of everything that man can do.' . . .*

A. If I said they were concentrating just upon the military, that was too narrow a statement of the case. They have been concentrating primarily upon scientific and technological work, which is largely utilized by the military, altho not exclusively so. But they do not allow many of their youth, I think any of their youth, to go to theological seminaries.

—Secretary Dulles, at press conference, Nov. 5.

*This statement never got into the U.S. press. Mr. Dulles's questioner, Philip Deane, of the London Observer, was the only correspondent who showed up at that science briefing, and the wire services—which were represented—did not think it worth reporting!—IFS

Where America Could Win in Humanity's Esteem

The ticker from Moscow indicates that insofar as domestic policy is concerned, Stalin is being upgraded as well as imitated by Krushchev; Zhukov's dismissal may be followed by another purge of the armed forces as in the 30's; in Poland, where there had been hope, the curtains are slowly being lowered, and the Communist parties everywhere are being shaken down again to an obedient core. The promise of the Twentieth Congress fades. Russia has made prodigious strides in science, but after 40 years, the dictatorship of the proletariat is still a dictatorship *over* the proletariat; the people are still in tutelage; the press still feeds them pre-digested decisions supported by one-sided versions of what has occurred in the upper ruling circles. This absence of freedom, this lack of democracy, is a weakness not a strength. In a race for the esteem of mankind, peacefully competing, this is the terrain on which our country could cover itself with honor—if we had the courage really to encourage freedom at home, instead of merely talking about it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will All That Pooling Talk End Only in Lifting the Atomic Restrictions on Germany?

The U.S. As Well as the U.S.S.R. Is Walking Out on the Arms Talks

The day Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Kuznetsov announced the Soviet Union's withdrawal from the UN's present 12-man disarmament committee and its 5-man subcommittee, the *Washington Post's* Chalmers Roberts was being briefed at the State Department on the fact that (*Washington Post*, Nov. 5) the Eisenhower-Macmillan "pooling" program was based on the "grim" assumption "that no agreements can be negotiated with the Kremlin," adding (in a resounding understatement) that Secretary Dulles "never has been an enthusiast for negotiating with the Soviet Union." This is not so different from the heart of Kuznetsov's statement. He asked the UN Political and Security Committee how one could expect results from the 5-nation arms subcommittee when four of them are members of NATO and the Eisenhower-Macmillan communique of October 25 pinned NATO's hopes on "the intensification of the arms race."

Men to Watch Indeed

In this connection it is worth noting that pressure is being exerted from Washington (1) to discourage France from making its own atomic weapons and (2) to revise the 1954 agreements under which Germany agreed not to make atomic, biological, or chemical weapons and rockets. . . . A headline in the London *Daily Sketch* of Nov. 2 illustrates the build-up to be expected, "Big Two Call in German A-Brains". . . . The "pool" idea is already dead, though it hangs on in the after-fumes of the headlines. . . . Congressional coldness and Dulles's hostility is turning the idea toward a system of division of labor rather than pooling of brainpower. Each of the Western allies would work on specific projects, sharing the results by bilateral agreement. We would keep the major projects for ourselves, thus avoiding an outcry in Congress about security and the giving away of secrets. Since this is quite different from true partnership, and too much like the over-ballyhooed but long moribund NATO Mutual Weapons Development Program of three years ago, it will provoke sour reactions at next month's Paris meeting. . . .

The 'Loopholes' Go Back to 1776

New step in the glorification of our secret police: Don Whitehead's feeble official portrait of the FBI is now to be filmed with Jimmy Stewart playing the lead role as an FBI agent. "The task now," Dorothy Manners reported from Hollywood in the Hearst press Nov. 4, "is to find the actor to play the J. Edgar Hoover part when Hoover was about 29. Although Hoover's role is not dominant, it was J. Edgar himself who personally negotiated the deal with Jack Warner for the screen rights." . . . In his address to the FBI National Academy Nov. 4 Hoover said that in 1949 the nation was "confronted with a subversive conspiracy of staggering proportions. The Communist party itself numbered well over 50,000 members . . ." If 50,000 Communists are "staggering" in a nation of 170,000,000, then Italy and France, each with less than a quarter our population but with several million Communists should have staggered to their doom long ago. . . . Hoover's main theme was the "lack of vision and misdirected effort" which was enabling criminals "and subversive elements" to use "loopholes" in the law. . . . In something of a new high in overstatement, Hoover declared, "A typographical error in a warrant or indictment can paralyze the wheels of justice"—but only until it has been retyped. . . . The real "loopholes" are in the Bill of Rights—the Fathers seem to have been the original subversives. . . .

For Journalism Students

If a minister of the gospel were kidnapped and beaten in the Soviet Union, the story would be on every front page in America. But it was hard work on Nov. 5 finding the story of how a Rev. T. D. Wesley was horse-whipped by three car-loads of attackers the night before in Selma, Ala. We couldn't find it in the New York Times but the Washington Post gave it four paragraphs on page 19 and the Baltimore Sun three paragraphs on page 3.

Indifference bordering on contempt was evident in the way the Associated Press handled the story. The rival United Press lead said "Three carloads of white men, including one in a 'Klan-type' mask, kidnapped and horse-whipped a Negro minister, Sheriff Carl A. Griffin reported tonight" and added that the minister was whipped when he refused to "talk about Negro integration leaders in the State." But the Associated Press omitted any mention of the motive and began its story this way, "A Negro minister says he was lashed by white men as he drove home from his church." It ended, "Officers said he was severely beaten but not seriously injured." No doubt the boys were just funnin'.

Higher Salaries, More Respect for 'Profs' . . . Pay for College Students?

"It doesn't do much good, however, to provide quality graduate study facilities and fellowships for potential teachers if what lies beyond graduate school is social and economic disappointment. It is nothing short of a national disgrace that we are discouraging people who want to teach by offering salaries that are far below the level justified by their training and far below the levels which others are willing to pay. . . . If college teachers in these fields are not paid adequately, they will soon become as scarce as competent science teachers in high schools. . . .

"In a sense, however, low salaries for college teachers are simply a reflection of a more fundamental fault—the lack of respect accorded to teaching by the public. A society that has become preoccupied with action [and money—IFS] has, I am afraid, tended to neglect those whose function is somewhat more remote from the arena of activity. The task of reestablishing the college professor as a key figure in our society, worthy of society's high regard and reward, is a task that requires more than raising salaries. . . .

"It disturbs me greatly that the best estimates available indicate that about one-third of the top quarter of our high school graduates do not now go on to college. This is a serious national waste . . . the concept that a student's tuition fee should be equal to the total cost of his education . . . seems to assume that only the individual derives benefits from his education, and it tends to limit opportunities for higher education to those who are relatively wealthy. . . .

"The most qualified Russian high school graduates—about 30 percent—are offered free higher education, and all but the weakest students are actually paid for going to college."

—Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Conf. on Sc. Educ., Chicago, Nov. 2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Debate the Press Ignored: The U.S. "Abstains" Again on South African Racism

State Department "Tones Down" Its UN Delegation on Apartheid

United Nations, N. Y.

In 1952 the U.S. voted to put *apartheid* on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly but has always abstained from voting on any resolution which specifically criticized South Africa for racial discrimination. Again this past week when the General Assembly, sitting as the Special Political Committee, voted 59 to 5, with 10 abstentions, appealing to South Africa to "revise its policy," the U.S. abstained.

Less surprising than this abstention was the equivocal speech made by Herman B. Wells, president of Indiana University, the U.S. spokesman in the debate. Except for the *Baltimore Sun,* whose Paul W. Ward gives the UN unusually comprehensive coverage, the press seems to have ignored the entire debate.

Ward reported (Nov. 1) that Wells, a Republican, wanted to make a strong speech because of Little Rock and that two other U.S. delegates, George Meany and Philip M. Klutznick of B'nai Brith, "helped Wells draft a stronger speech" only to have it toned down by the State Department.

But, On The Other Hand . . .

The queasy wording of the speech as finally delivered avoided any direct condemnation of *apartheid.* It said South Africa's policy is "under attack here, as discriminatory." On the other hand, Mr. Wells added, South Africa claimed that *apartheid* was "non-discriminatory and not oppressive" but "the best solution . . . for the difficult problem."

Wells then went on to say that "without condoning in any way" South Africa's policy, "a number of other governments openly practice policies which deprive their citizens of basic human rights." Racial problems were "complex" and the UN might help by "positive studies" but had no power and although this was the sixth session at which the Assembly had discussed the question, "we have regrettably seen no improvement." This was as close as he came to expressing disapproval.

This year only five nations voted against the resolution, all white and all colonial powers which govern colored peoples, four of them in Africa. The five were Australia, Belgium, France, Portugal, and Great Britain. The abstainers, besides the U.S., were Argentina, Canada, Dominican Republic, Finland, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, and Spain.

Strange Kind of Guardian

"The government of the Union of South Africa defined the relationship of the European to the non-European community as being that of guardian to ward. What would be thought of a guardian who, in deliberate defiance of the best medical and scientific opinion, persisted in regarding his ward as mentally defective and treating him as such?"

—Cruise O'Brien (Ireland) UN Debate on Apartheid.

Spain still has, and Italy until the war did have, African possessions. Thus from the colored man's point of view the white empires either voted against the resolution or abstained, though not one nation spoke in defense of South Africa.

The Iranian delegate, in opening the debate, made the crucial point. There was race discrimination almost everywhere but South Africa "was the only one in the community of nations which had adopted racial segregation as a goal." Iraq said that in pursuit of this objective South Africa had begun "to apply rigorous measures of repression which would actually amount to genocide." Ghana protested that on *apartheid* the great Powers had taken refuge behind legal technicalities in sharp contrast to their position on Hungary.

Latin America Called Mulatto

Fabregat of Uruguay protested that the dark peoples of the Union of South Africa had been "sequestered" like people "in concentration camps" and cited the "repugnant" statement of its Prime Minister, who said that without *apartheid,* South Africa would become like "the mulatto republics of Latin America." The remark rankled everywhere below the Rio Grande. Ethiopia said South Africa was trying to spread its policy throughout the African continent and warned this might lead to "desperate actions."

India, on the last day of debate, expressed admiration for "the trend of legislation, enforcement and executive measures adopted by the United States under the leadership of a great President." Even this went unreported. The U.S. press treated the whole debate as of no importance. But in the question of *apartheid* we ignore a volcano, and put our moral pretensions to shame.

What the President Failed to Explain About the School Integration Ruling

President Eisenhower's fuzzy grasp of the integration issue was again evident in his press conference of Oct. 30. He said the South had lived "for 56 years under a social order that was approved by the Supreme Court, and specifically with respect to education, the theory of separate but equal facilities. Now they are asked to consider the whole system unconstitutional and, naturally, this causes difficulties." This is expressing it as the Southern white supremacists do, and helps to create the impression that the South is somehow the victim of the Supreme Court.

There are several things wrong with this way of putting it, aside from the puzzling reference to 56 years; Plessy v. Ferguson, which first established the separate but equal doctrine, was in 1896, or 61 years ago. The Plessy ruling was one in a series of decisions which cut down the protection the Fourteenth amendment was intended to give the Negro while building that amendment up as a safeguard of corporate rights.

When Justice Brown wrote for the Court in Plessy that while the Fourteenth amendment was, of course, intended to bring about "absolute equality of the two races before the law" but "could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based on color", he set a high water mark for sophistry. Harlan, dissenting, provided the perfect answer when he retorted that the Constitution was "color blind." But bad as Plessy v. Ferguson was, it did not do what the President implied. Neither that decision nor any other decision by the Supreme Court since slavery was abolished ever authorized white supremacy as practiced by the South. The Court did not, in talking of separate but equal facilities, endorse a social order actually based on separate and degradingly unequal facilities. It is this on which the country needs to educated, if the propaganda of the South is to be combatted. Education must begin in the White House.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Canada's Lester Pearson Attacks "Diplomatic Rigidity" and Frozen U.S. Policy

The First Western Statesman to Say the Missile Age Calls for Co-Existence

Lester B. Pearson, Canada's former Foreign Secretary, made a speech at the University of Minnesota Nov. 3 worthy of the 1957 Nobel Peace Prize recently awarded him. Except for an appreciative editorial in the Washington Post Nov. 6 and a news story in the New York Times, the U.S. press largely ignored the speech because it went counter to cold war policy. We give the gist of it here:

". . . One of two things will happen. (1) Nuclear war with inter-continental missiles against which no present defense would save us from total destruction; or (2) Suspension between uneasy peace and global war in a state of tension and fear . . . all history shows that unless we do something about it, the second will ultimately lead to the first . . . nor does it do any good . . . to wrap ourselves in a cloak of impeccable rectitude and diplomatic rigidity. . . .

"What do we oppose to this controlled and centralized society? Too often, merely the well-born cliches of the superiority of freedom and democracy and our 'way of life'. . . . Soviet life, Soviet policy, I know, is founded on power and compulsion, rather than consent. But are we sure that our own social purpose . . . is steady. . . . The very word freedom has now lost some of its earlier angry meaning of stern and sturdy resistance to pressures and persecutions. . . . Surely we are not going to escape total state control in order to seek security in the 'big organization' type of social and economic conformity. . . .

"We have, then, two duties in the West; first, to protect our institutions within the city walls from deterioration and decay, and then to defend the walls themselves.

The Supreme Obligation of All Men

"There is, however, a third and even more important duty: to bring about a state of affairs in the world where no one will wish to attack us at all—or we, them; where eventually walls themselves will be as much of an anachronism as trenches, barbed wire and forts on the U.S.-Canadian border. This is the supreme obligation of all men in all nations. . . .

"Our insistence on the primacy of this task of making peace by international negotiation; our seizure of every political opportunity to this end, does not mean that we should or need contemplate agreements which would betray either our friends or our principles. Indeed peace on such terms would be false and any arrangements made would be worthless. I know that there are those who look with suspicion on every move which is made that implies a desire or even a willingness to negotiate; who call it 'appeasement'—one of those words debased by polemics—or softness toward Communism. Such critics forget that if total and unremitting hatred of Communism were the only test of loyalty to democratic ideals, Hitler would be the greatest democrat of all time. . . .

"I quite realize that the easiest, and in some quarters the most popular attitude that we could adopt in the cold war would be a relentless and immovable stand on a platform of inveterate and inflexible hostility to Soviet Russia and determined opposition to every move she makes or tries to make any place any time.

The Hope of Unconditional Surrender

"The corollary to this means taking steps to counter and defeat every such move in the hope that Russia will eventually accept without conditions our terms for ending the cold war and withdraw—actually and ideologically—behind her old Czarist boundaries. I see myself no prospect of any such easing of tension, and, ultimately, of international peace and security, if we base our policy and diplomacy on any such thesis. . . .

"I accept the fact that no matter how enlightened and flexible our policy, we cannot safely allow it to result in a weakening of what the military call our defense posture. If, however, we allow an exaggerated and provocative posture to result from, or be encouraged by, a rigid 'unconditional surrender' type of diplomacy, we make the establishment of peace through tolerable arrangements even more difficult than it is. . . .

"There is a ferment of freedom ever at work, even in Russia; for freedom, as the epic of Hungary has shown, cannot be rooted out of the human mind by force or by fraud. . . . Such an evolution, however, will be held back, perhaps indefinitely, if we take fixed and final positions now in opposion to every Russian move. As I see it, if and when Russia has a legitimate interest in some area or some development, we would be foolish to act as if that interest can either be ignored or attacked.

"Such an attitude, of course, plays right into the hands of the worst elements inside the Kremlin. It also weakens our position in those nations who have no love for Communism but refuse, for reasons which seem perfectly good to them, to take sides in the cold war. There are situations in the world today which do not admit of any permanent solution which will bring about stability, without Russian participation in, and at least acceptance of, that solution. We might as well admit that hard fact. . . ."

Remember, Please, Every Reader Get A Reader—and Widen the Audience for Peace

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for $4 (1 yr.) or $2 (6 mos.) additional:

11/11/57

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED